



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/926,408	02/04/2002	Robbie Thielemans	THIE3004/JEK	2069

23364 7590 05/18/2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 SLATERS LANE  
FOURTH FLOOR  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
----------

ANYASO, UCHENDU O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/926,408

**Applicant(s)**

THIELEMANS ET AL.

**Examiner**

Uchendu O Anyaso

**Art Unit**

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. **Claims 29-56** are pending in this action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 29-50 and 53-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In independent claims 29 and 53, applicant included in the claim language the feature of “the control communication sent from the general processing unit to each of the individual processing being **independent from the data stream** sent to each processing unit.” Applicant then contends in his Remarks that support for this feature is found on page 2, lines 26-35 of the specification. However, after a review of this section, support for this added feature in this section is not found.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2675

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

**5. Claims 29-33, 37, 38, 49, 50 and 53-56** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Nishida* (U.S. 6,097,351).

Regarding **independent claims 29 and 53**, and for **claims 49, 50 and 54**, *Nishida* teaches a display device including an array of display elements to display information in that the display device is made up of a plurality of display units 50 (see Abstract; *see also* column 6, lines 17-21, figure 2 at 50).

Furthermore, *Nishida* teaches a general processing unit in the form of a control device 70, a display in the form of device casing 100 that consists of several device display units 50, and individual processing units in the form of controller 53 per display units 50 (*see* figure 2, 3 at 50, 53, 70, 100, column 6, lines 17-33; column 7, lines 1-8).

Furthermore, *Nishida* teaches how the control device 70 is provided for generating display signals to be supplied to the respective display units 50 through a signal transmission passage 71 (column 6, lines 30-33, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71).

Art Unit: 2675

Also, Nishida teaches how the control device 70, electric power passage 61 and signal transmission passage 71 facilitates the control communication between the control device 70 and each of the display units 50 in the form of signal transmission passage 71 wherein data from this signal transmission passage are collected at every display unit 50 (column 6, lines 29-45, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71).

Regarding **claim 30**, in further discussion of claim 1, Nishida teaches how the display units 50 are serially coupled (figure 2 at 50).

Regarding **claim 31**, in further discussion of claim 1, Nishida teaches how the display units would be made up of light emitting diodes (column 8, lines 41-67, figure 5 at 83R, 83G, 83B).

Regarding **claim 32**, in further discussion of claim 1, Nishida teaches how the control device 70, electric power passage 61 and signal transmission passage 71 facilitates the control communication between the control device 70 and each of the display units 50 in the form of signal transmission passage 71 wherein data from this signal transmission passage are collected at every display unit 50 (column 6, lines 29-45, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71).

Regarding **claim 33**, in further discussion of claim 4, Nishida teaches an embodiment wherein individual display units 80 include a main body 81 that contains three light emitting

Art Unit: 2675

diodes 83R, 83G, 83B such that when activated, they present red, green and blue colors to the pixels (column 8, lines 41-67, figure 5 at 83R, 83G, 83B).

Regarding **claim 37**, in further discussion of claim 4, Nishida teaches how distributed signal processing is at least provided for the signals by teaching how the control device 70, electric power passage 61 and signal transmission passage 71 facilitates the control communication between the control device 70 and each of the display units 50 in the form of signal transmission passage 71 wherein data from this signal transmission passage are collected at every display unit 50 (column 6, lines 29-45, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71).

Regarding **claim 38**, in further discussion of claim 9, Nishida teaches how signal processing occurs at both the control device 70 and the display units 50 by teaching how the control device 70, electric power passage 61 and signal transmission passage 71 facilitates the control communication between the control device 70 and each of the display units 50 in the form of signal transmission passage 71 wherein data from this signal transmission passage are collected at every display unit 50 (column 6, lines 29-45, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71).

Regarding **claims 55 and 56**, in further discussion of claim 25, Nishida teaches how the respective display units 80 can be removed for operational tests thereby making maintenance work very simple (column 10, lines 43-49, figure 10 at 80).

6. **Claims 51 and 52** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Wong* (U.S. 6,005,557).

Regarding **independent claim 51**, Wong teaches a method for stabilizing a display panel image corresponding to an image information signal having an associated phase and frequency, comprising: generating a dot clock signal having an associated phase and frequency to facilitate the display of the image information signal as the image; displaying a vertical noise bar indicative of the dot clock signal frequency not corresponding to the image information signal frequency; adjusting manually a single control device to generate a clock adjust signal; controlling said dot clock signal phase and said dot clock signal frequency simultaneously in response to said clock adjust signal to help synchronize said dot clock signal phase with the image information signal phase while adjusting said dot clock signal frequency to correspond to the image information signal frequency (column 9, lines 59 through column 10, lines 17).

Regarding **claims 52**, in further discussion of claim 23, Wong teaches a time-dependent image stabilization by teaching a timer device 44 that controls the dot\_clk signal 42 via the HSYNC signal (column 4, lines 4-15).

Also, Wong teaches a frequency dependent image stabilization by teaching apparatus 10 that includes a control apparatus 30 to enable the user to manually adjust the phase and frequency of the dot\_clk signal 42 wherein the frequency of the dot\_clk signal 42 may be adjusted to correspond to the frequency of the image information signal 12 (column 4, lines 8-15; column 3, lines 23-32, figure 1 at 10, 42).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC ' 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 34-36, 39-44** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishida* (U.S. 6,097,351) in view of *Someya et al* (U.S. 5,396,257).

Regarding **claims 34-36**, in further discussion of claim 5, Nishida does not teach how to adjust the brightness or contrast of the display device. On the other hand, Someya teaches a multiscreen display apparatus in which one large screen is formed by combining screens of a plurality of display units (*see* Abstract) wherein luminance is adjusted by the control device (*see* Abstract; column 13, lines 9-26, figure 13 at 81).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Nishida and Someya because while Nishida teaches how the control device 70 is provided for generating display signals to be supplied to the respective display units 50 through a signal transmission passage 71 (column 6, lines 30-33, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71), Someya teaches how such a device would be used to adjust luminance. The motivation for combining these inventions would have been to provide a multiscreen display apparatus capable of reducing luminance shading and color shading between a plurality of display units (column 2, lines 39-42).



Regarding **claim 39**, in further discussion of claim 9, Nishida does not teach how the display units adjustments operates in a frequency independent fashion. On the other hand, Someya teaches this concept by teaching that a great feature of the present embodiment is that the comparison circuit 102 and the contrast control circuit 88 and the luminance control circuit 89 controlled by the comparison circuit 102 are completely separated from the minimum value circuit 90, the ABL circuit 114 and the contrast and/or luminance control circuit 111 and hence they operate independently (column 22, lines 66 through column 23, line 4).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Nishida and Someya because while Nishida teaches how the control device 70 is provided for generating display signals to be supplied to the respective display units 50 through a signal transmission passage 71 (column 6, lines 30-33, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71), Someya teaches how the adjustments would occur in an independent fashion. The motivation for combining these inventions would have to provide a multiscreen display apparatus capable of reducing luminance shading and color shading between a plurality of display units (column 2, lines 39-42).

Regarding **claim 40**, in further discussion of claim 9, Someya teaches how a switching pulse (SP) is a control pulse synchronized preferably with a falling edge of a horizontal synchronizing pulse and having a pulse width T wherein the switching pulse (SP) controls the input signal of the contrast and/or luminance control circuit 111 (column 17, lines 3-17).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Nishida and Someya because while Nishida teaches how the control device 70 is provided for generating display signals to be supplied to the respective display units 50 through a signal

Art Unit: 2675

transmission passage 71 (column 6, lines 30-33, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71), teaches how a switching pulse (SP) is a control pulse synchronized preferably with a falling edge of a horizontal synchronizing pulse and having a pulse width T wherein the switching pulse (SP) controls the input signal of the contrast and/or luminance control circuit 111 (column 17, lines 3-17). The motivation for combining these inventions would have been to provide a multi-screen display apparatus capable of reducing luminance shading and color shading between a plurality of display units (column 2, lines 39-42).

Regarding **claims 41-44**, in further discussion of claim 9, Nishida teaches how signal processing occurs at both the control device 70 and the display units 50 by teaching how the control device 70, electric power passage 61 and signal transmission passage 71 facilitates the control communication between the control device 70 and each of the display units 50 in the form of signal transmission passage 71 wherein data from this signal transmission passage are collected at every display unit 50 (column 6, lines 29-45, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71). However, Nishida does not teach how to achieve high resolution. On the other hand, Someya teaches how the display device is wired in order to achieve a high-resolution display (column 6, lines 34-49).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Nishida and Someya because while Nishida teaches how the control device 70 is provided for generating display signals to be supplied to the respective display units 50 through a signal transmission passage 71 (column 6, lines 30-33, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71), Someya teaches how the display device is wired in order to achieve a high-resolution display (column 6, lines 34-49). The motivation for combining these inventions would have to provide a multiscreen display

Art Unit: 2675

apparatus capable of reducing luminance shading and color shading between a plurality of display units (column 2, lines 39-42).

9. **Claims 45-48** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nishida* (U.S. 6,097,351) in view of *Wong* (U.S. 6,005,557).

Regarding **claim 45**, in further discussion of claim 1, *Nishida* does not teach how the display device provides image stabilization. On the other hand, *Wong* teaches a method and apparatus for stabilizing an image formed on a display panel (column 1, lines 5-11).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine *Nishida* and *Wong* because while *Nishida* teaches a display device with an array of display elements to display information in that the display device is made up of a plurality of display units 50 (see Abstract; *see also* column 6, lines 17-21, figure 2 at 50), *Wong* teaches a method and apparatus for stabilizing an image formed on a display panel (column 1, lines 5-11). The motivation for combining these inventions would have been to provide a user with a convenient adjustment technique that results in optimum stabilization (column 2, lines 10-15).

Regarding **claim 46**, in further discussion of claim 17, *Wong* teaches a time-dependent image stabilization by teaching a timer device 44 that controls the dot\_clk signal 42 via the HSYNC signal (column 4, lines 4-15).

Also, *Wong* teaches a frequency dependent image stabilization by teaching apparatus 10 that includes a control apparatus 30 to enable the user to manually adjust the phase and frequency of the dot\_clk signal 42 wherein the frequency of the dot\_clk signal 42 may be

Art Unit: 2675

adjusted to correspond to the frequency of the image information signal 12 (column 4, lines 8-15; column 3, lines 23-32, figure 1 at 10, 42).

Regarding **claim 47**, in further discussion of claim 1, Nishida does not teach how the display device provides a master clock correction in order to achieve image stabilization. On the other hand, Wong teaches how the dot\_clk signal would be adjusted/corrected in order to appropriate image stabilization (column 6, lines 26-34, figures 6-9 at 39, 42).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Nishida and Wong because while Nishida teaches a display device with an array of display elements to display information in that the display device is made up of a plurality of display units 50 (see Abstract; *see also* column 6, lines 17-21, figure 2 at 50), Wong teaches how the dot\_clk signal would be adjusted/corrected in order to appropriate image stabilization (column 6, lines 26-34, figures 6-9 at 39, 42). The motivation for combining these inventions would have been to provide a user with a convenient adjustment technique that results in optimum stabilization (column 2, lines 10-15).

Regarding **claim 48**, in further discussion of claim 19, Nishida teaches an embodiment wherein individual display units 80 include a main body 81 that contains three light emitting diodes 83R, 83G, 83B such that when activated, they present red, green and blue colors to the pixels (column 8, lines 41-67, figure 5 at 83R, 83G, 83B).

*Response to Arguments*

10. Applicant's arguments filed March 3, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding independent claims 29 and 53, applicant amended these claims to include the feature of “the control communication sent from the general processing unit to each of the individual processing being independent from the data stream sent to each processing unit.” Applicant then contends in his Remarks that support for this feature is found on page 2, lines 26-35 of the specification. However, after a review of this section, support for this added feature in this section is not found.

Specifically, this section states that “the invention concerns a method for displaying images on a display device, characterized in that use is made of a display device comprising at least a general processing unit, a display consisting of several display units and an individual processing unit per display unit, whereby, in order to display the images, data concerning the image to be displayed are transmitted from the general processing unit to the individual processing units in the form of a data stream, in that there is a control communication between the general processing unit and each ... “ No where in this paragraph does Applicant teach the feature of “the control communication sent from the general processing unit to each of the individual processing being independent from the data stream sent to each processing unit.” As such, the specification is not written or described in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Hence, this is new matter.

Regarding claim 47, applicant argues that the display elements in his invention are current driven while Nishida is voltage driven. However, a complete reading of Nishida teaches an embodiment wherein the light-emitting diodes are controlled so as to take either of the two states of light on and light off, but it is possible to supply luminance signals to the respective light-emitting diodes and control current supply by the regulators so that the light-emitting diodes emit light of luminance's corresponding to the luminance signals (column 10, lines 64 through column 11, line 3). As such, applicant's assertion that the display elements in his invention are current driven while Nishida is voltage driven is not persuasive.

Regarding claim 48, applicant argues that in the display device of his application, the drive current can be adjusted in order to adjust the brightness and thus the contrast of the display. Applicant then contends that in Nishida, the adjustment of the display is not possible. In response to this applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the drive current being adjusted in order to adjust the brightness and thus the contrast of the display) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding claim 51 and 52, applicant contends that Wong recites a control device that is manually adjusted. As such, Applicant contends that Wong does not result in dynamic image stabilization. However, applicant may have applied a narrow reading of Wong. This is because Wong also teaches an embodiment that does not manually adjust a control device to generate a clock adjusting signal. Specifically, Wong teaches "a single control device for generating a

Art Unit: 2675

clock adjust signal” (see column 10, lines 54-55; see generally column 10, lines 44 through column 11, lines 3). This embodiment does not manually adjust the control device. As such, this aspect of applicant’s argument is not persuasive.

Regarding claim 34, applicant argues that neither Someya nor Nishida disclose a method including adjustments such as dynamic sample weight distribution, corrective adjustments in function of temperature and/or age, transfer function adjustments or enlargements of incoming video signal. However, the preamble of claim 34 clearly states the “step comprising of making **at least one individual adjustment** at the individual processing units, **said at least one individual adjustment** being selected from the group consisting of: ..., adjustment of brightness, ...” Hence, the focus of Someya teaches at least one of the individual adjustment i.e., a display apparatus wherein luminance is adjusted by the control device (see Abstract; column 13, lines 9-26, figure 13 at 81). As such, this aspect of applicant’s argument is not persuasive.

Regarding claim 39 and 40, applicant argues that Nishida does not teach how the display units adjustments operates in a frequency independent fashion. However, Someya teaches this concept by teaching that a great feature of the present embodiment is that the comparison circuit 102 and the contrast control circuit 88 and the luminance control circuit 89 controlled by the comparison circuit 102 are completely separated from the minimum value circuit 90, the ABL circuit 114 and the contrast and/or luminance control circuit 111 and hence they operate independently (column 22, lines 66 through column 23, line 4).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Nishida and Someya because while Nishida teaches how the control device 70 is provided for

generating display signals to be supplied to the respective display units 50 through a signal transmission passage 71 (column 6, lines 30-33, figure 2 at 50, 70, 71), Someya teaches how the adjustments would occur in an independent fashion. The motivation for combining these inventions would have to provide a multiscreen display apparatus capable of reducing luminance shading and color shading between a plurality of display units (column 2, lines 39-42).

Regarding claim 41-44, applicant argues that neither Nishida nor Someya teach raising the frequency in individual processing units, raising the line frequency in a general processing unit, and distributed signal processing for signals which determine the image geometry. Applicant merely regurgitated the key features of claims 41-44 without addressing reasons why or how the Office Action rejection fails to address these features.

As for claims 45-48, applicant argues that Wong fails to disclose or suggest dynamic image stabilization. Similar to the arguments presented in claims 51 and 52, applicant may have applied a narrow reading of Wong. This is because Wong also teaches an embodiment that does not manually adjust a control device to generate a clock adjusting signal. Specifically, Wong teaches “a single control device for generating a clock adjust signal” (column 10, lines 54-55). This embodiment does not manually adjust the control device. As such, this aspect of applicant’s argument is not persuasive.

### ***Conclusion***

**11. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).



A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uchendu O. Anyaso whose telephone number is (703) 306-5934. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Saras, can be reached at (703) 305-9720.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


Application/Control Number: 09/926,408  
Art Unit: 2675

Page 17

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Uchendu O. Anyaso

05/14/2004

  
**CHANH NGUYEN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**